24th February 1930]

Motor Vehicles Act

Regulation of the speed of motor vehicles.

*1488 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) the latest measures adopted by the Government to regulate the speed of motor vehicles so as to prevent accidents; and

(b) the number of prosecutions under the Motor Vehicles Act and the Indian Penal Code instituted at Madras for the offence of causing accidents during the year closing with 31st December 1928 and the half-year closing with 30th June 1929 and with what result?

A.—(a) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to the Legislative Council question No. 93, given at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 8th August 1929, and to notification No. 851, Law (General), dated the 4th November 1929, published at page 2058 of Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated the 12th November 1929. A proposal to amend rule 41 of the Madras Motor Vehicles Rules relating to the speed limit of heavy motor vehicles is also under the consideration of Government.

(b) A statement[a] of prosecutions instituted at Madras for rash and negligent driving against motor drivers is appended.

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA:—"May I enquire, Sir, what the nature of the proposal to amend rule 41 is?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"It is not possible for me to say at present. It is under consideration."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—"Will the hon. Member be pleased to lay the proposal on the table of the House?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"No, Sir, I am sorry."

Police

Alleged assault of Mr. Kelappan Nair by the police at Quilandi.

*1489 Q.—Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Mr. K. Kelappan Nair and others were arrested by the Divisional Officer of Calicut and Mr. K. Kelappan Nair was assaulted by the police at a meeting held at Quilandi when an address of welcome was presented to the hon. the Health Minister;

(b) whether the Government have received any resolutions of public meetings held at Calicut and other places regarding this occurrence;

(c) whether the Government have instituted any inquiry into the allegations made against the Divisional Officer and the police; and

(d) if not, whether they propose to institute any inquiry into the matter?

---

[a] Printed as Appendix IX on page 152 infra.

[24th February 1930

A.—(*a*) Mr. Kelappan Nair and three others were arrested on the occasion; they were not assaulted by the police.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) The Government have received a report from the District Magistrate of Malabar.

(*d*) They do not propose to take any further action.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar :—"Why were they arrested?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur :—"Because they wanted to create trouble, Sir."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar :—"In what way? The word 'trouble' is very vague and would cover a multitude of things."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur :—"They wanted to disturb the meeting while the hon. Minister was present."

Civil Justice

Proposed transfer of one of the Sub-Judges at Bapatla to Tenali.

* 1490 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that a large number of suits more than one year old are pending in Bapatla Sub-Court in spite of the fact that two Subordinate Judges are working for a number of years there;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the High Court has recommended one of the Sub-Judges of Bapatla Sub-Court to be transferred to Tenali;

(*c*) what are the reasons adduced to shift one of the Sub-Judges to Tenali in solving the excess pendency in Bapatla Court;

(*d*) whether the Government have passed any orders on the recommendation of the High Court to shift one of the Sub-Judges from Bapatla to Tenali;

(*e*) whether the Government will be pleased to defer passing any orders on this question pending investigation into the whole question of pendency of suits in this whole district;

(*f*) whether the Government will be pleased to open a new Sub-Court at Tenali without disturbing the two Sub-Judges at Bapatla;

(*g*) whether the Government have received any memorial from the Bar Association of Bapatla regarding the shifting of one of the Sub-Judges from that place; and

(*h*) what is the estimated cost to Government (i) of shifting one of the Sub-Judges at Bapatla to Tenali and (ii) of opening an independent Sub-Court at Tenali?

A.—(*a*) On the 1st October 1929, 133 ordinary suits over one year old were pending on the file of the Bapatla Sub-Court.

(*b*), (*c*), (*d*) & (*e*) No definite proposals have been received from the High Court on the subject.

(*f*) The Government await the advice of the High Court in the matter

(*g*) Yes.

(*h*) The cost of opening an independent Sub-Court at Tenali will be Rs. 22,420 roughly; and in the event of the shifting of the Additional Sub-Judge, Bapatla, to Tenali, the additional cost will be Rs. 10,360 roughly. (The above figures do not include the cost of the building and pensionary charges.)